



Town of Paradise Valley

6401 E Lincoln Dr
Paradise Valley, AZ 85253

Minutes - Final

Hillside Building Committee

Wednesday, November 10, 2021

8:00 AM

Town Hall Boardroom

**IN-PERSON ATTENDANCE AT PUBLIC MEETINGS HAS BEEN SUSPENDED UNTIL
FURTHER NOTICE. WATCH LIVE STREAMED MEETINGS AT:
<https://paradisevalleyaz.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>**

Committee Members

1. Call to Order

Present: 4 - Scott Jarson, Scott Tonn, William Nassikas and Pamela Georgelos

2. Executive Session

3. Application Review

4. Staff Reports

[21-356](#)

Formal review for a new single family residence at 6516 E Meadowlark Lane (APN 174-51-029).

Hugo Vasquez, Hillside Development Administrator, introduced the first item including a history of the site. He noted that the application would be reviewed under the current 2018 Hillside Development regulations. He indicated the proposed plans were for a single-family home including a pool on the north side of the residence. He noted that they were allowed about 34% disturbance on the site, but plans were for approximately 26%. He shared that the applicant met all the height requirements and has provided material boards. He pointed out that the lighting plans included mostly can lights and all landscaping was proposed with native plants.

Steven Brenden, Project Architect, remarked that he believed the house blended in with the desert well and that this was a successful hillside desert landscape project.

Chairperson Jarson stated it was helpful to see the existing condition of the lot next to the proposed changes. He indicated that he was pleased with the color palette and materials. He inquired what portions of the roof were metal versus foam.

Mr. Brenden explained that the sloped portion of the roof was metal, and the other portions of the roof were foam.

Chairperson Jarson asked if they planned to add solar to the project at some point.

Mr. Brenden indicated there was currently no interest in doing solar. He indicated that they have installed solar panels in the past but put them in flat and below the parapet.

Chairperson Jarson requested they consider a lightweight ballast such as the chip that could enhance the surface.

Mr. Brenden indicated that the homeowners general and roofing contractor advised against it and so they have declined to commit to it.

Chairperson Jarson remarked that it looked like the water was being well handled on the site and appreciated the native plants in the landscaping plan. He noted that he also felt the lighting plans were reasonable.

Member Scott Tonn indicated that he was satisfied with the lighting plans if they did not shine on any vertical surfaces.

Member Pamela Georgelos remarked that the design was pleasing and appreciated there was parapets to properly screen solar if it was added in the future.

Chairperson Jarson opened the public comment period on this item. There were no comments.

Chairperson Jarson asked if it would be acceptable to add the lightweight ballast or chips on the roof as a stipulation.

Mr. Brenden stated that he did not feel he could speak on behalf of the applicant on that.

A motion was made by Committee Member Tonn, seconded by Committee Member Nassikas to approve subject to stipulations. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Jarson, Tonn, Nassikas and Georgelos

[21-357](#)

Combined review for a new pool, remodel, and addition at 5704 E Starlight Way (APN 172-02-011A).

Mr. Vasquez remarked that there was a previous application for the site but this one was entirely new. He shared that the application was for renovations to an existing home including the addition of a new lap pool. He noted that the grading and drainage plan has been provided and met code. He reviewed landscaping plans which consisted of mostly native plants with a few nonnative plants in the garden area and existing oleanders on the property would be removed. He

stated that since there was concern about erosion in the area, they have proposed staggered boulders to avoid creating a wall feature. He presented drawings of the entry gate, water feature, pool area, and glass railings.

Mr. Vasquez shared photos of the existing site and noted there was a lot of non-complying color since the property was built prior to hillside regulations. He provided the building height elevations and material palette. He presented an overview of outdoor lighting and noted there were some up lights on the water feature as well as some inconsistencies in the number of lights in the plan. He noted that there was also some overlap of path lights that he would recommend removing.

Devan Porter, Architect, noted that the setback for the lighting was at ten feet and they followed that. He added that they were comfortable going of the lighting plan included in the landscape plan.

Chairperson Jarson cautioned them to be careful with the travertine and ensure that what is being installed is not lighter than what was proposed.

Member Tonn asked how they derived the average Light Reflectance Value (LRV) of 32% on the silver travertine. He noted there were two materials identified as having an LRV of 32% but visually they looked different.

Zoe Pinfold, Interior Designer with Meyer Davis, replied that there was a typo, and the lighter travertine was 32% and the darker material was closer to a 27% LRV. She indicated that she could provide them with further data on the spread that was used to come up with the 32%.

Chairperson Jarson asked where the silver travertine appeared on the site.

Ms. Pinfold indicated it would be used for the entirety of the pool deck and north terraces as well as an accent on the south entry and auto court.

Member Georgelos stated she was concerned on how the silver travertine would look in large areas. She noted that it looked like it had a lot of white in it and would be quite reflective. She inquired about the drainage and flows on the site and how it has been taken into consideration with the redesign.

Mr. Vasquez explained that they had regraded the driveway entrance and auto court area and that there was a dry well with onsite retention provided. He pointed out that the existing wash would not be disturbed and that they were providing more onsite retention in the new design than the original one that was proposed.

Chairperson Jarson opened the meeting up for public comments on the item. No public comments were offered.

Mr. Vasquez indicated they had received a comment from the neighbor to the east of the site asking if their views would be affected by the changes.

Mr. Porter noted that they were dropping a retaining wall on the west side of the

property and putting in a glass guard which should increase views across it. He noted that as far as architectural intervention there should be no change. He pointed out that a few plants would be put in to create more privacy in front of windows on the site. He clarified that he did not believe there would be any reduction of views.

Member Nassikas remarked that he believed it would be problematic if there was any construction parking along Superstition Road since it was heavily trafficked.

Mr. Vasquez noted that during the permit stage they will have to provide a construction staging plan that will show anything that would interfere with traffic and if they need to park offsite, they will provide the location for that to be approved by staff.

Member Georgelos asked if there was anything they should be concerned about in the courtyard. She noted that she liked the use of the clear glass if it was not too reflective.

Mr. Vasquez noted that freestanding walls were not permitted on hillside but since these ones created an enclosed courtyard with the home it was permitted in the code.

Mr. Porter commented that there were existing walls currently creating a courtyard in that same area, but the plans were to replace the walls and expand them to the west. He noted the height of the wall would not be changed from the existing one.

Member Tonn pointed out that since the new wall came directly off the garage it created a larger wall that was architecturally a lot all in one line.

Ms. Pinfold remarked that the intent was not to have a massive wall along the south façade. She explained that the walls were decorative and perforated and setback slightly from decorative metal entry gate.

Chairperson Jarson stated that he felt the courtyard was appropriate, given the location and the fact that this was a remodel.

Member Nassikas agreed. He indicated that the location was mostly out of sight until you were on the entry circle. He noted that he felt the plans were only an improvement to the existing courtyard.

Chairperson Jarson asked if the sail canopy would remain.

Mr. Vasquez noted that it was not shown on the plan, but they could add that it be removed as a stipulation.

Pete Newman, Homeowner, indicated that he would like to have the option to leave it there if possible.

Chairperson Jarson motioned for approval of file application 21-357 subject to

the existing 15 stipulations by staff in addition to two stipulations. Stipulation 16, material board to be updated to reflect accurate LRV estimates for the stone materials and the silver travertine as indicated to be replaced with an alternate selection or application to provide additional LRV averages to reflect 32 or lower, all of which subject to approval by staff and chair. Stipulation 17, existing sail panel at garage to be LRV complaint or removed as desired by applicant, subject to approval by staff and chair.

A motion was made by Chair Jarson, seconded by Committee Member Tonn to approve subject to stipulations. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Jarson, Tonn, Nassikas and Georgelos

5. Committee Reports

Chairperson Jarson reported that he presented a hillside update to a real estate community called Luxury Home Tour and had approximately 150 people in attendance.

6. Next Meeting Date

Chairperson Jarson announced that their next two meetings would take place on Wednesday, December 8, 2021, at 8:00 a.m. and Wednesday, January 12, 2022, at 8:00 a.m.

Mr. Vasquez stated they had about three applications for the December meeting. He noted that they could push the December meeting back a week to the 15th to fit in a few more applications before the end of the year. He indicated he would follow up with committee members to finalize the date.

Lisa Collins, Community Development Director, reported they had a new hillside planner joining them soon as well as Jim Zuganelis the new Community Development Administrative Assistant.

7. Adjournment

A motion was made by Chairman Jarson, seconded by Committee Member Tonn to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Jarson, Tonn, Nassikas and Georgelos